UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR /3-0403CRB
Plaintiff,)
Melthon Branch) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT)
	JUN 2 4 2013
Defendant.	RICHARD W. WIEKING
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on Speedy Trial Act from 7.4. 2013 to 1	CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT the CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT the Color of Justice Served and S. J. 2013 and finds that the ends of justice served
by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the result of the resul	public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continuance would See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).	
Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
——————————————————————————————————————	unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given itments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	anreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time king into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 5 M	LAUREL BEELER
	United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED:	(malia)
Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Atterney